

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 * * *

6 MANUEL C. ROGERS,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 DR. MATTHEW MARX,

10 Defendant.
11

Case No. 2:25-cv-00990-RFB-NJK

ORDER

12 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6) of the
13 Honorable Judge Nancy J. Koppe, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on June 23, 2025.
14 A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
15 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific
16 written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)
17 (1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is
18 required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified
19 proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see
20 also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not
21 required to conduct “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of
22 a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a),
23 objections were due by July 7, 2025. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the
24 record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

25 ///

26 ///

27
28 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6) is

1 **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in full.

2 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

3 The Clerk of Court is instructed to close this matter accordingly.

4
5
6 **DATED:** July 23, 2025.

7
8 

9 **RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II**
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28